Appeal: 14-7590 Doc: 9 Filed: 03/17/2015 Pg: 1 of 3

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-7590

CHARLES A. BIRDSONG,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

HAROLD CLARKE, Dir. of D.O.C.,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. James R. Spencer, Senior District Judge. (3:13-cv-00786-JRS)

Submitted: March 12, 2015 Decided: March 17, 2015

Before GREGORY, DIAZ, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Charles A. Birdsong, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Charles A. Birdsong seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition challenging his Virginia state convictions for aggravated malicious wounding and use of a firearm. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A) (2012). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2012). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 debatable or wrong. (2000); see Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the petition states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. Slack, 529 U.S. at 484-85.

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Birdsong has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis, and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral

Appeal: 14-7590 Doc: 9 Filed: 03/17/2015 Pg: 3 of 3

argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED